

REMARKS

The present application was filed on December 29, 2000 with claims 1-19. Claims 1, 11-17 and 19 have been amended. Claims 1-17 and 19 remain pending, and claims 1, 17 and 19 are the pending independent claims.

In the outstanding Office Action dated May 12, 2006, the Examiner: (i) rejected claims 1-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph; and (ii) rejected claims 1-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,963,909 to Warren et al. (hereinafter "Warren").

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite, Applicants have amended claims 1, 17 and 19 to more clearly define the present invention. Specifically, Applicants have amended the independent claims to recite that the subset of the plurality of cryptographic token keys enables decryption of one of more corresponding encrypted sequential data blocks of the transferred subset of the plurality of encrypted sequential data blocks. Support for this amendment can be found on page 7, lines 19-24 and page 10 lines 15-23, of the Specification. Dependent claims 11-16 have been amended to maintain consistency with the independent claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is therefore respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Warren, Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 17 and 19 as suggested by the Examiner. Independent claims 1, 17 and 19 have been amended to recite that the non-selected cryptographic token keys are not transferred to the receiving client as defined by the sending server, in accordance with the access status of the receiving client. Independent claims 1, 17 and 19 have also been amended to recite that the receiving client is enabled to access only a selected portion of the media file as defined by the sending server, in accordance with the access status of the receiving client. Support for the amendments can be found on page 7, lines 14-23, page 8, lines 1-5 and page 12, lines 5-11, of the Specification..


Warren discloses the reproduction of a full multimedia signal through the use of multimedia frames and encryption keys. However, Warren fails to specifically enable the receiving client to

access only a selected portion of the media as defined by the sending server, in accordance with an access status of the receiving client. Warren also fails to disclose transferring the subset of the plurality of cryptographic token keys from the sending server to the receiving client, wherein non-selected cryptographic token keys are not transferred to the receiving client as defined by the sending server, in accordance with the access status of the receiving client.

Dependent claims 2-16 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency from independent claim 1, and also contain patentable subject matter in their own right. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 1-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1-17 and 19 are on condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §112 and §102(b) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert W. Griffith
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 48,956
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-4547

Date: August 14, 2006